NEW TREATISE ON

THE REFORM OF THE UNDERSTANDING

By Victor Excelcius

Lisbonna, MMXXI

I.

So what do we live for? What is the value of life? Is there a path through philosophy, just as there are others such as biography, biology, or the way of common sense? Is finitude the defining criterion of “how one should live life”? Doesn't it prevent us from living this awareness of finitude? Yes, how should life be lived? And is there any moral purpose in this precept of the mind?

If science best seeks the human condition through the study of human discourses and behaviors, human and social science, where to insert and how to understand madness and unreason? At least we have these two variables, which the human being more or less accidentally attends to and the scientist understands. But what becomes of the philosopher within this framework that is, in a certain sense, ‘social’? Society subsumes itself to divinity, is it not also a totality of human manifestations? Is not man the forgotten, decentralized center of philosophy?

Won't the spirit journey be a strictly spiritual achievement? And is it not also mental? Does man not need to flee from himself in order to find himself, not having to invent happiness within small recurring spaces, but rather in a larger sphere such as the city? The city, moreover, is a medina, in our view.

Is not, on the other hand, the woman (or the man) the alter ego of the heterosexual or homosexual couple? Yes, the couple is a kind of incompatible offshoot of the solitary Ego, and upon this everything in the world rests; its moral dimension is carried to the extremes of consanguinity, with or without dowry, within the nuclear dimension of society microsociety that represents and animates it. Even the writer who writes for himself is pursued by the shadow of the Other, whom he needs to nourish himself spiritually (which in its origin comes from the spiritual, from spirit), both in himself and in the Other as Self, in the Self as Other.

Thus, in terms of social philosophy, it is necessary to offer a method to philosophy, that is, the ethnographic method, through ethnographic fieldwork. At this juncture

we see man (and woman) in action in their spatiotemporal context. Is it not therefore necessary to turn to traditional societies to understand man, that is, to philosophize about the human being and his condition in terms of a social and cultural determination?

And what is this construction of society that awaits us? Why not liberalize in the face of suicide? Consider the problem in philosophical-social terms and in terms of the autonomy of the Self. If Western society has conquered material freedom, it may well be a trap for those who, having conquered everything, are not happy and then think and find that there is nothing more to conquer, thus generating a ruinous cycle of unhappiness that leads to drugs and to death by suicide. But since we were born, aren't we dying in and for the world?

Then, in another way, life is not always a celebration, as some anthropologists would have us believe. It is also anguish, which does not mean that philosophy is necessarily anguish. But it takes the decaying Being and tries to understand, instead of lifting him, as if drawing from him the strength to do one thing or another, giving him the space, in time, at the edge of virtue, to rise and rise, to walk again, for philosophy is first of all not the goal, but the way, therefore, happiness, instead of celebration in terms of the social and cultural.

II

We intend to refocus the debate of the human sciences on man, the subject of social action, of the discourse on the sciences, indicating that philosophy can be endowed with the method of social anthropology, that is, the fieldwork of inquiry about the opinion of the Other about himself. In other words, it is about bringing maieutic back to the center of philosophical debates. This is equivalent to philosophy considering as useful, its own, the vocations of anthropology, art, science or merely activity, philosophical work. Not only does the opinion of the individual matter, be it a philosopher, but also the opinion of the Other, as is often the case in anthropology, and it doesn't have to be primitive. On the other hand, the study of social psychology, ethology, and sociobiology makes us more attentive to the development of social life, understanding the various aspects of which man is composed, of which the human is made, and the way in which he both challenges reality, social and physical, and trains it, adapts, and then transforms it for his benefit. This does not mean that man is, as religion tells us, the king of creation. He is in the midst of others, including minerals and vegetables, and it is not sound language that makes him superior, but the capacity for abstraction. Therefore, I have the opportunity to do philosophy. And, how to define Man? He has the gift of being framed in a social and cultural context. It is this predetermination that defines him, and even if he was at the margins of society, he always has with him, carries with him, a certain identity; that is, he is an id of anything, he is ‘that’ anything, always in relation to the Other.

III

So does the philosopher have any role in society? If so, which one? The one everyone else doesn't want, lost and sidetracked from the century? In order to mate, does he need to be inserted in this century, in the times that are passing? And what particular idea do you have about mating if hormones are configured in this sense? Isn't the philosopher simply a living organism with an excess of rationalization? Therefore, we maintain, the philosopher needs to be an anthropologist, to incorporate certain principles of social anthropology, namely, to ask the Other what he thinks, whether primitive or not, so as not to remain confined in the Cave all the time, from which he only emerges to breathe and to satisfy basic needs…

They know the intellectual superiority of the philosopher. But not all philosophers are intellectuals; indeed, a great many of them are lazy and make a certain form of thought depend on their own mind, not to say that a certain number of people also depend on it. So, what is the status of the philosopher in society, of the sociologist, of the anthropologist? Philosophy of science is being done, and many engineers or mathematicians are philosophers without having followed an academic path within the field of the social and human sciences. Quite a disruptive idea this one…

The importance of the philosopher is of intrinsic quality; that is, only the philosopher can feel the anguish and the despair proper to the philosopher. The others, except for the Philo-anthropologists, do not feel these feelings; therefore, the social usefulness of these feelings is restricted to the condition of doing philosophy, or rather, of reading; thus, the capacity for abstraction is an activity to which not everyone can have access and which is achieved over time, through the training of the most diverse dispositions of the human spirit, which stretches, distends, and perceives itself in time…

Because if Being is important in philosophy, Belonging can be important in anthropology and sociology; that is, we are bound to one another, and this determines any and all ethical endeavors, also in relation to finitude, that is, contingency in the

face of time, which can make us better people, even without much recourse to religion, to religious explanation. Man is not without, on the other hand, the mask, the ***persona*** of his personality; therefore, man is always an actor, whether in artistic terms or as a social actor, within the plasma of the human landscape of everyday life, of what has been conventionally called reality in generic terms and social reality in more restricted terms.

How, then, can one erect a science of society if the object of study is always in motion, if not even literature or art can capture the vastness of what is human, of the human soul? Perhaps it is philosophy that will raise this edifice. Much of philosophy does not erect, but has a critical task. How then to understand man, in the desert or in the great cities? Will this task be up to religion? Is theology a science, a science of the indivisible, of the unsayable?

IV

Indeed, the common issue in all relations is power; that is, what organizes and silences people is the power of something higher than them in terms of decision-making, therefore religion falls within that domain. We always believe in anything (a totem) or anyone (a god, an authority) who is superior to us, never inferior, because we ourselves, even infinitely, exercise power, even in the face of a domestic animal. What is special about beings little inclined to hierarchical power relations, who see society as a power and locus of equality and egalitarianism, is that they are more contemplative than active; that is, their will hangs in the air before they decide. That's why they don't like to be criticized. Usually, in one way or another, this is a way of exercising power; that is, I am not an eminently practical subject because practicality generates equality, and philosophical discourse generates instances and conditions of power in a certain symbolic way. In this way, it is easy for the philosopher, I mean, familiar, to feel nausea about his existence and to be close to limit situations or even to abuse certain resources, such as drink or tobacco, because he is concentrated, he is busy, of a world that has no actors, in which he is with his mind, the only actor, so he feels nausea and loneliness that leave a dent in his personality, in his social ***persona*** and make him a kind of untouchable of society, that is "the one who cannot be touched", who imitates himself in behavior and whose opinion is respected, while the crowd is reveling he reads and writes philosophical treatises, in some way to perpetuate himself and the society that welcomes him as a thinker, a wandering thinker, where the instrument of his perception is not the senses, as in anthropology, gastronomy and wine, the pleasures of sex, but the vice of thinking, often generating a certain inferiority complex that he feels, precisely because to be in the realm of the century, in the present, untouchable and at the same time the fruit of a society, of a context of cultural scope, which at the same time circumscribes and makes abandon its philosophical system of thought.

Thus, as current life is characterized by the mask in a context of plague. A mask, in an anthropological sense. The plague, in the philosophical sense, that is, what is threatened is the persona as a mask bearer who hides and conceals his true Self, we are all masks in the context of a plague that only the domestic sphere intends to eliminate or, at least, disguise. But while the mask is medical and therapeutic, it indicates the social function of health in terms of the visibility of neurodiversity within medical and social spheres. The plague highlights what is probably the greatest prescription that the national group has, in individual and collective terms: the Last Judgment. For this reason, the Mass is still celebrated, even if relying only on the celebrants, the members of the clergy, and the choir. Without assembly, even God trembles, because he has no one to give him existence, subsistence, or prominence, namely, the people.

Because the Good God is the one who allows himself to be questioned in his authority, as the head of the family in accordance with the destiny of his children, his sheep, as voters and citizens in democracy, that is, assessing the manifestation of the most basic rights, be they animals or humans, on the stage of differences and minorities, purified by so many centuries of philosophy and science.

Thus, what the poet reduces to the enchantment and training of mysticism, the philosopher reduces to the banality of the engine of thought: the everyday, between the dazzle and the punctuality of the celebration. The philosopher thus sees no need to celebrate, for his success arises from his action-satisfaction extended over time, which he fulfills through his status in everyday life. Likewise, he tries to breathe in the supernatural quality of immersion in culture, his daily life punctuated by the wait for the right thought and, if he writes, for the right concept and the right word, as if he were describing the unraveling of souls, whether in death throes or in ecstasy, still in this world and returning to it as its witness. The philosopher's culture is, then, Time, the time he must be a poet of culture's emphasis and of the stellar movement of the stars and the satellites of feeling that may inhabit a nightclub in Bairro Alto.

Thus, the sphere of practicality is, above all, that of constructing a world and increasing worlds to this semi-constructed world, making the globe domestic as in the globalization of Discoveries. But it is also a sphere of destruction, as the recent guerrillas for independence in Spain, Catalonia and the Basque Country demonstrate. In social and individual terms, socio-individual. On the other hand, the sphere of contemplation has to do first of all with the context of religion, that is, contemplating, at another moment of practicality, the work done, that is, contemplating second-hand action and preparing new action, so that action and contemplation, practicality and theory, are only different moments of a process at the threshold of human history and ingenuity. Hence the relevance of anthropology in the context of a new understanding of Man and the Cosmos.

And, to put the terms in another way, will there be a place for solidarity among those who do philosophy in today's times? Philosophy, as well as other social sciences, has become a justification for evil to protect the dictatorial power of the media, delivered always to the same people and the same families, as well as in politics, sports in general, and football in particular. There is, therefore, a philosophical discourse that, among us, even has to do with the exaggeration of evil, in order to, as they say, understand human nature in the domestic sphere, in a context of maximum possibilities that end up making the senses and pure reason of the most banal circumstances sick, promoting a society of spectacle and romantic love-dreams, instead of the old dream of the man who wants to build houses in his village and surroundings and who has in his DNA the same as the entrepreneurs of the industrial revolution, to build, to build, in a final plan in favor of otherness, of the Other, of surrendering to the Other his maximum possibilities of living and winning, of succeeding, of “defending” himself.

As wine, life, biography, existence, needs to be analyzed and if we have this, this process, through time in intergenerational terms, here is anthropology, social and cultural, that is, the missing link of human existence is sought, but it is right under our noses, our beards, because even the younger generations recognize certain principles that, more than merely educational, are cultural, have to do with a common fund that is transmitted from parents to children, from children to grandparents, as bonds that are now made or are broken with the use and domestication of time in a certain space, in a more or less adequate cosmos, more or less manufactured and thought, evidently in a context where one has to earn money to feed and preserve certain purpose of life in terms of individual and family existence. In all this, there is a time of vain existence, that is, moments of pond, which more correspond to days and days of melancholy and almost inactivity, because what is most precious to social life has been lost, namely, interaction and this cannot dispense with any philosophy, because even the hermit sees some people. Or you've seen it.

Then, after that, when social scientists or philosophers discover the isthmus, the connection between common sense and philosophy, many answers can be fully given; that is, while we have on the one hand the majority of the population, in demographic terms, harboring a common sense thinking, we have another component, the intellectuals, whose way of understanding reality is scientific and erudite. This phenomenon can be seen in philology, that is, in the evolution of the language, as happened with Latin, for example. There was in Rome a learned form, that of the upper castes, and a vulgar Latin, for the use of the people. There are interferences from one side to the other, from one form of language to the other, communicating vessels, interferences, and interpenetrations, and both records evolve, exchanging influences, and the scholar feeds on the vulgar and this, in this case, ended up withering while that of the people gave rise to the Neo-Latin languages, better known as Romance. In this case, the Church played a definitively important role in shaping what played a definitely important role in the composition of what is

currently Portuguese, shaped what was said, said what could be said, and did not say what could not be said.

Collective social life needs to be stirred by celebration and from there to influence the exteriority of the subject. But if it's not the sum of all of them plus an extra one, if it doesn't have an interchangeable flame, it will go out in a short time. Therefore, both social and individual life need to be stimulated, sometimes with the feasts of the saint of the earth, sometimes by the loving relationship. Does the hermit, at the height of his transcendence, have memories of his former life? Is it he who is in the cave or will it be all the others together, by certainly fleeting ties in lovelessness, when existence in time perfects and makes us wiser, if we know how to find a distinct balance throughout the days? Even monks have their own community, which obeys a very specific set of rules. And, in intense social life or in the convent, is it not happiness that is at stake? Isn't that the happiness we all seek on our starry path?

VII

Why does anthropology in human sexuality have one of its brightest fields when philosophy seems, always, made and planted by men, in its generality full of defects and, above all, macho? The spirit, retained in a body in different ways, has difficulty understanding sexuality; reason has always been the enemy of the senses. But is it so? Hedonism, logical positivism, and avant-gardens, which of the movements is right, and what is the role of the intellectual in today's life in this practically post-pandemic society? Yes, because relationships, human and social, and the virus, the disease, have changed the pattern of people's relationships with each other and, by extension, the way of seeing sexuality and affections on the screen of everyday life, which has become trivialized rather than festively celebrated...

So, what is the meaning of life? Is being happy about discovering that meaning? Or is there some other more or less mechanical way of extracting meaning for the mind and the heart during this stay of ours, interrupted as it is by time? Is it time that robs us of meaning and, therefore, happiness? If we were eternal, would we be forever happy?

Likewise, forgetting and remembering are two mechanisms that belong to and propel human action. What, then, is existential to human action? The phenomenology of truth, the fact, the accuracy in the relationship with the environment, and the production of meaning that helps you to progress within the social and natural space? What is essential to human action? The fact that his soul is always sticking to the space around him and onwards, unlike the pathology that separates him from the world and erects reason as the holder of the truth... Whatever it is, what is existence? The object out of the senses? Or is it merely the essence transformed into something the subject apprehends and relates to others, to produce a chain of meaning, overvalued at certain moments and at others turned into something utterly banal? Does the philosopher need to be properly himself, to leave himself, the Ego, to relate the Id to the most diverse things in nature?

VIII

If the monk is denied Having, the philosopher has it. But the philosopher tends to annul the monk's territories, to occupy them, before and after leaving himself in a nihilistic pessimism that characterizes much that they do not even suspect the overwhelming role of depression and mental illness, perhaps because he has never gone through philosophical crises, those crises that make him grow, and has always valued only material values and not Heidegger's Being. So why is the philosopher so bent on depression and carrying the weight of the world? Because he worries, the world, in its possibility of eternity, is the fruit of anticipated worry. For this reason, happiness, as if only he knew how to tame time, included the Time of the Other and asked for nothing in return but the recognition of his writings and the philosophical diatribe. But the philosopher lives in the world, the monk does not, even if we can see the convents as replicas of society, of a certain form of society, where he is happy, I do not know if he is happier than the philosopher, deluded by capitalist consumerism and oblivious to the things of religion other than in ceremonial terms, as if to fulfill a ritual that he soon gets rid of on the floor of everyday life, in the banal role of postmodern, hyperactive, hypertextual society, where there are many people producing on the same theme, many people producing on the most varied themes, in a society that corrodes the discharge for lack of ethics, even when there was ethics at the same time, on the other hand, it did not exist. Is it possible, then, nowadays, to achieve happiness with a lack of ethics? What is it really like to be happy? Is it like eating a good meal? Is it to obey the classical authors, even while knowing that many of them are sexist and patriarchal in their thinking? Hence, in my view, the fact that there are so few women philosophers.

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below